



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

Applicant	Monterey Peninsula Water Management District	County	Monterey
Project Title	Feasibility of ASR Expansion	Grant Request	\$ 201,801.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 228,211.00

Project Description: The proposal includes drilling an exploratory borehole and installing a cluster of monitoring wells at the potential Phase 3 Aquifer Storage and Recovery site. MPWMD uses the cuttings and geophysical logs to determine if the occurrence of targeted Santa Margarita Sandstone is sufficient to move forward with the third phase.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	8
Budget	3
Schedule	5
QA/QC	3
Past Performance	2
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	31

- **GWMP or Program:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The Applicant does not possess an adopted GWMP because the Basin is adjudicated and is not allowed to adopt a GWMP. However, the Applicant does provide a Basin Action Management Plan that was adopted in 2009.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The applicant supplies a complete description of the proposed project by explaining that they intend to drill an exploratory borehole and install a cluster of monitoring wells. Furthermore, the applicant details that the goals of the proposal are to improve groundwater management and knowledge of the basins hydrostratigraphy, provide ongoing water level and water quality monitoring, and aid the management of the basin in a number of categories. The applicant also provides a map of the needed facilities that will include a cluster of shallow and deep monitoring wells. In addition, the applicant demonstrates collaboration through quarterly meetings that include various regional stakeholders such as, Cal Am, NOAA and CDFG. This is a forum where stakeholders share information with regard to the management of the groundwater basin. The overall description does implicitly demonstrate that the proposal will help the basin achieve a more balanced safe yield. As a result, the applicant is able to explain a long-term need., Moreover, the applicant demonstrates that a definite and achievable quantity of new knowledge will be obtained through installing the wells by gaining geophysical, water quality and continuous water level data, and explains that ongoing use of the proposed product will continue to be funded in MPWMD's ASR program budget.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. The applicant's Work Plan sufficiently describes what will be done and what the product will be. Also, the Work Plan explains how information gained by the proposal will be disseminated to the public in the Project Description section. Lastly, the applicant adequately explains a plan to comply with CEQA and obtaining all the necessary permits and regulatory requirements in task 2. However, the applicant does not present a sound strategy for evaluating performance. For instance, the Applicant neglects to list any deliverables or quarterly reports to account for their progress at each step of the proposed project. All project sites are within publicly owned land. and thus private property access will not be required.
- **Budget:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The Applicant's Budget includes enough details to assume that it is realistic and cost effective in meeting the proposals objectives, however the budget is neither consistent nor supported by the Work Plan or Schedule. For example, the Budget has 36 tasks whereas the Work Plan and Schedule include only 11 tasks. Furthermore, the Budget begins with Permitting whereas the Work Plan and Schedule begin with Request for Bids. In addition, the Budget includes cost share funding match but neglects to include a discussion regarding the source of the money. Lastly, the applicant does not identify other types of funding.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **Schedule:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The applicant's Schedule includes timelines that appear realistic, and presents appropriate detailed tasks that define how the Schedule was derived, including start and end dates well within the maximum PSP's maximum 2-year timeframe. Lastly, the Schedule illustrates that it will be ready to proceed as soon as funding becomes available.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The applicant's Quality Assurance Program does not include well-defined project specific data quality objectives and appropriate QA/QC measures. Furthermore, the Applicant does not sufficiently describe procedural assurances, such as specific processes for quality of Reports, data and lab analysis in the QA/QC scoring criteria section. The Applicant does not list specific standardized methodologies to be used, such as construction standards, health and safety standards or laboratory analysis.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The Applicant does not provide any documentation to demonstrate that they are capable of performing high quality work, managing funds, and/or meeting deadlines for similar types of projects.